

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,746 03/16/2004		Regis Berger	12008-6US SC/sm	12008-6US SC/sm 1186	
20988	7590	05/03/2005		EXAMINER	
OGILVY F		T LLP EGE AVENUE		FRANCIS	S, FAYE
SUITE 1600		LOE AVENUE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MONTREA	L, QC I	13A2Y3	3728		
CANADA	•		DATE MAILED: 05/03/2009	S	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/800,746	BERGER ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Faye Francis	3728					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period way - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ma	arch 2005.						
	action is non-final.						
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
 4) Claim(s) 6-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 6-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 12. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 13. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 14. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 15. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 16. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 17. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 18. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 12. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 13. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 14. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 15. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 16. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 17. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 18. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 18. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 18. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 18. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 18. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 18. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/16/04.	6) Other:	Sign Approvator (1 10-102)					

Application/Control Number: 10/800,746

Art Unit: 3728

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of group II in the reply filed on 3/10/05 is acknowledged.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means", "said," and "comprising" should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because legal phraseology "comprising" has been used in line 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/800,746

Art Unit: 3728

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 11: the phrase "a body perimeter" is confusing since it is not clear whether the applicant's is referring to the same body as in line 3 of claim 6 from which claim11 depends or not.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger et al. [5,699,915], hereinafter Berger in view of Higgins [4,050,219].

Berger discloses in Figs 1-5, a pack of compressible particle material [palletized peat moss 100] comprising a base [pallet 104], a body of compressed particle material [peat moss 102] in bulk form upstanding freely from the base and compressed directly thereon [via plastic film 106] as recited in claim 6, the compressible particle material is peat moss as recited in claim 7. Additionally, Berger discloses the peal moss has a water content ranging from about 25 to about 50 weight % and a density ranging from

Application/Control Number: 10/800,746

Art Unit: 3728

about 0.05 to about 0.15 gm/cc on dry basis directly thereon [col 5 lines 54-57] as recited in claim 8, the base is a pallet as recited in claim 10.

Berger does not disclose a bag enclosing the body and producing a compressive force thereon so as to retain the compressed particle material in bulk compressed form on the base, the bag is stretchable having a mouth perimeter which is smaller than a body perimeter when the bag is in a relaxed state as recited in claim 11.

Higgins teaches the concept of providing a loaded pallet with a stretchable bag 24 formed of tubing of resilient film, the bag enclosing the body and producing a compressive force thereon so as to retain the compressed particle material in bulk compressed form on the base [col 1 lines 58-68] and the bag having a mouth perimeter which is smaller than a body perimeter when the bag is in a relaxed state [col 3 lines 58-65] in order to provide the load with even covering. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the bag covering as taught by Higgins in order to provide the load with even covering and also to reduce the labor cost by reducing the time required to cover the load. To the extend if Higgins fails to disclose the bag out of plastic, it would have been obvious to make the bag out of plastic to make it more cost effective [see cited patent to Stirling for example only].

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was Application/Control Number: 10/800,746 Page 5

Art Unit: 3728

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faye Francis whose telephone number is 571-272-4423. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 571-272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Faye Francis

FF